REMARKS

The applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action of 11 December 2006. In response, the applicants amend independent claims 1 and 2 so as to more clearly patentably distinguish over the prior art. Support for these amendments is found throughout the specification including in the paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 and Figures 2, 3a, 3b and 4 (note second or tool receiver 56 provided in end wall 62 of first or wand receiver 52). In addition, claim 20 is cancelled without prejudice.

Turning to the substantive issues, claims 1, 2, 6-8, 11, 15 and 17 are currently rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4.653,638 to Lackner et al. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 21 and 22 are currently rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 2,450,172 to Stoner. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15 and 23 are currently rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,528,794 to Tomasiak. In addition, claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11, 15, 17, 18 and 21-23 are currently rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,313,686 to Berfield. Finally, claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,832,408 to Roney et al.

As cited and applied by the Examiner, the Lackner et all patent discloses a first means or wand receiver (see Figure 2, reference numeral 13) and a second means or cleaning tool receiver (see Figure 2, reference numeral 18).

As cited and applied by the Examiner, the Stoner reference discloses a first means or wand receiver (see Figure, reference number 46) and a second means or cleaning tool receiver (see Figure 1, reference numbers 38, 52).

As cited and applied by the Examiner, the Tomasiak patent discloses a first means or

wand receiver (see Figure 4, reference number 25) and a second means or cleaning tool

receiver (see Figure 4, reference number 33).

As cited and applied by the Examiner, the Berfield reference discloses a first means or

wand receiver (see Figure 2, reference number 64) and a second means or cleaning tool

receiver (see Figure 2, reference number 66 or Figure 3, reference number 68).

As cited and applied by the Examiner, the Roney et al reference discloses a first means

or wand receiver (see Figure 4, reference number 38) and a second means or cleaning tool

receiver (see Figure 4, reference number 46).

All of the references cited by the Examiner disclose first means/wand receivers separate

from second means/cleaning tool receivers. As amended claim 1 provides that the second

means is in the first means on the body. Claim 2 provides that the body includes a wand

receiver and a cleaning tool receiver in the wand receiver. Combined holders comprising a

cleaning tool receiver in a wand receiver are not disclosed in the art cited and applied by the

Examiner. Accordingly, it is believed that amended independent claims 1 and 2 patentably

distinguish over the art and should be allowed. Claims 3-10 and 22 which depend from

independent claim 2 and are rejected on the same grounds are equally allowable for the same

reasons. In addition, claim 21 which depends from independent claim 1 is also allowable for

the same reasons.

Independent claim 11 also clearly patentably distinguishes over the art and should be

Page 7 of 8

Application No. 10/825,383

Amendment and Remarks dated March 7, 2007

Reply to Office Action dated December 11, 2006

formally allowed. More specifically, independent claim 11 reads on a tool holder comprising

a body including a first receiver for holding the wand and a second receiver in the first receiver

for holding the cleaning tool when the wand is removed from the first receiver. The concept

of providing a cleaning tool receiver within a wand receiver is simply not disclosed in the art

cited and applied by the Examiner and, accordingly, independent claim 11 patentably

distinguishes over this art and should be formally allowed. Claims 12-19 and 23 which depend

from independent claim 11 and are rejected on the same grounds are equally allowable for the

same reasons.

In conclusion, all the pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and should

be formally allowed. Upon careful review and consideration it is believed that the Examiner

will agree with this proposition. Accordingly, the early issuance of a formal Notice of

Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KING & SCHICKLI, PLLC

Warren D. Schickli

Registration No. 31,057

247 North Broadway Lexington, Kentucky 40507

(859) 252-0889

Page 8 of 8